KIRSCH ARAK AND BULMASH 280 So! Beverly Drive Suite 300 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (213) 278-9250.

2

3

5

6

8 9

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Attorneys for Defendant CIRCLE INTERNATIONAL CO.



SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

GREMLIN INDUSTRIES, a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CIRCLE INTERNATIONAL CO. INC., etc. et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 416704 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Defendant CIRCLE INTERNATIONAL CO., a California corporation, for itself and no other and severing itself from all other Defendants herein, and in response to the Complaint on file herein, admits, denies and alleges as follows:

ANSWER TO FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Defendant CIRCLE INTERNATIONAL CO. INC. a 1. California corporation (hereinafter referred to as CIRCLE) admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint on file herein.

-1-

2. Defendant CIRCLE admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint on file herein.

3. Defendant CIRCLE, in response to Paragraph 3 of the Complaint on file herein, alleges that many of the shipments to CIRCLE from Plaintiff were C.O.D. and payable in Los Angeles, California and that only part of the shipments to CIRCLE from Plaintiff were payable in San Diego, California. Except as expressly alleged herein, Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint on file herein.

- 4. Defendant CIRCLE admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint on file herein.
- 5. Defendant CIRCLE lacks information or belief sufficient to enable it to answer the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint on file herein and based upon such lack of information or belief denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 5.
- 6. Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint on file herein.
- 7. Defendant CIRCLE admits that it is engaged in the business of distributing electronic video games at a place of business at 2225 West Pico Blvd. Los Angeles, California. Except as expressly admitted, Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every other allegation contained in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint on file herein. In particular, Defendant CIRCLE denies that it is indebted to Plaintiff in the sum of \$89,640.70, or any other sum or sums or at all.

本な は 大田

7 8

8. Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragarph 8 of the Complaint on file herein. In particular, Defendant CIRCLE denies that it is indebted to Plaintiff in the sum of \$89,640.70 or any other sum or sums or at all.

ANSWER TO SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 9. In response to Paragraph 9 of the Complaint on file herein, Defendant CIRCLE repeats and realleges its answers to Paragraph 1 through 6 of the First Cause of Action of the Complaint on file herein and by this reference therein incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- 10. Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint on file herein. In particular, Defendant CIRCLE denies that it is indebted to Plaintiff in the sum of \$89,640.70 or any other sum, or sums or at all.

ANSWER TO THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- 11. In answer to Paragraph 11 of the Complaint on file herein, Defendant CIRCLE repeats and realleges its Answers to Paragraph 1 through 6 of the First Cause of Action of the Complaint and by this reference thereto incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- 12. Defendant CIRCLE denies generally and specifically each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint

5 6 7

10

11

さんない というとのないというないと

18 19 20

22 23

25 26

24

27 28 on file herein and in particular Defendant CIRCLE denies that it is indebted to Plaintiff in the sum of \$89,640.70, or any other sum or sums or at all.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

That the Complaint on file herein, as well as 13. each cause of action purportedly alleged therein fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this answering Defendant.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant CIRCLE refers to its Cross-Complaint on file herein and by this reference incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

15. That at the time and place of each order from Defendant CIRCLE to Plaintiff, said Defendant made known to Plaintiff the particular purpose for which the goods were purchased. In particular, Defendant CIRCLE informed Plaintiff that said electronic games were to be sold to Defendant CIRCLE's customers for on-location use, primarily in arcades, taverns and bars.

Defendant CIRCLE, at the time and place of each such order relied on Plaintiff's skill and Judgment to select goods suitable for said Defendant's purpose, all of which was well known

16. That Plaintiff, at the time and place of each Order, impliedly warranted that the goods were fit for Defendant CIRCLE's purpose as hereinabove alleged.

- 17. That the goods were not fit for Defendant CIRCLE's purpose, but were, in fact, unsuitable for said purpose in that vast numbers of said electronic games were defective and failed to operate properly due to broken or missing parts, shoddy workmanship or improper assembly during manufacture; thus rendering said goods of no value to Defendant CIRCLE for resale, or otherwise.
- 18. That immediately upon discovery of said defects beginning in early November of 1977, Defendant CIRCLE discovered that the warranty of Plaintiff was false and immediately gave to Plaintiff due and timely notice thereof; but received no rectification of the afore-described defects from Plaintiff.
- 19. By reason of the foregoing Defendant CIRCLE could not fill orders to its customers on time, thus causing said orders to be cancelled, had to pay service department personned at Defendant CIRCLE's premises overtime premium to attempt to correct said defects in order to be able to ship said electronic games; incurred additional handling costs; and had to issue credits to some of its customers. The exact amount of Defendant CIRCLE's damages have not yet been ascertained, but said Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said items of damages exceed the amount sued for by Plaintiff. Defendant CIRCLE will seek leave of Court to amend its Answer to Complaint when the exact amount of its damages have been ascertained or according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2

1

4

5

7 8

9

11

011

> 17 18 19

> > 20

23

25 26 27

28

20. That beginning on or about November 1, 1977, Plaintiff sold to Defendant CIRCLE electronic games to be used by said Defendant for resale to its customers primarily for commercial on - location use at arcades, taverns, bars.

21. That at all times herein mentioned Plaintiff
GREMLIN INDUSTRIES was and now is, a merchant with respect to the
kind of goods sold to Defendant CIRCLE as hereinabove alleged and
described.

22. That Plaintiff GREMLIN INDUSTRIES, at the time and place of each said sale, impliedly warranted that said electronic games were of merchantible quality.

23. That said electronic games were not of merchantible quality, but in fact were defective in that many of said games failed to operate properly, had missing or broken parts, or were improperly assembled during manufacture.

24. That, therefore, said electronic games were of absolutely no use to Defendant CIRCLE, had no value, and could not be sold to Defendant's customers.

upon discovery of each defect as hereinabove alleged,
Defendant CIRCLE gave Plaintiff due and timely notice of the
defective quality of said goods.

26. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant CIRCLE could not fill orders to its customers on time, thus causing said orders to be cancelled, had to pay service department personnel at Defendant CIRCLE's premises overtime premium to attempt

The state of the state of

一人 一大大大大

to correct said defects in order to be able to ship said electronic games; incurred additional handling costs; and had to issue credits to some of its customers. The exact amount of Defendant CIRCLE's damages have not yet been ascertained, but said Defendant is informed and believes thereon alleges that said items of damages exceed the amount sued for by Plaintiff. Defendant CIRCLE will seek leave of Court to amend its Answer to Complaint when the exact amount of its damages have been ascertained or according to proof at the time of trial.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

- 27. That in or about November 1977, Plaintiff GREMLIN INDUSTRIES, through its President, Frank Fogleman, agreed to accept merchandise invoiced to Defendant CIRCLE in the approximate minimum amount of \$29,000.00, said goods to be returned to Plaintiff and credit to be issued to Defendant CIRCLE, for the reason that said goods were defective.
- 28. In reliance upon Mr. Fogleman's agreement to issue credit for said returns in consideration of the defects relative to said \$29,000.00 of goods, Defendant CIRCLE, through its President Mr. Dean McMurdie, arranged to, and did, have said goods returned to Plaintiff.
- 29. That in breach of its agreement to accept said goods for return and issue credit thereon, Defendant GREMLIN refused to accept delivery of said goods, thus causing them to be returned to Defendant CIRCLE; and thus causing Defendant CIRCLE in incur roundtrip freight charges. When the exact amount of said

charges are determined, and according to proof at the time of trial, Defendant CIRCLE will seek leave of Court to amend this Answer to set forth the same.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

orders to Defendant CIRCLE, thus causing said Defendant to lose business due to order cancellations, and to lose profits on resale. Defendant CIRCLE will seek leave of Court to amend this Answer when the exact amount of said lost sales, or profits, have been ascertained or according to proof at the time of trial.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

- 31. That Plaintiff GREMLIN INDUSTRIES, INC., is the sole manufacturer and only source of the electronic game products and/or parts which it manufactures. Further, said Plaintiff only sells its products, including parts, to distributors for resale to the ultimate purchaser.
- 32. That at all times herein mentioned, or relevent,
 Defendant CIRCLE was, and is, a distributor of products and/or
 parts manufactured by Plaintiff. Further, Plaintiff GREMLIN
 INDUSTRIES, INC. since in or about November, 1977, has been
 selling its electronic game products and/or parts to other distributors who compete with Defendant CIRCLE in the same marketplace, and who are in the same category of a distributor, as is

KIRSCH, ARAK AND BULMASH 280 SOUTH BEVENT DEVYS, SUITE 300 BEVENLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90212 -8-

Defendant CIRCLE.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Since at least in or about November, 1977, Plaintiff 33. has offered for sale and sold to other distributors, aside from Defendant CIRCLE, and who are in direct competition with Defendant CIRCLE, in the same marketplace, each and all of Plaintiff's products at Plaintiff's normal established prices; while at the same time forcing Defendant CIRCLE to pay a 150% "premium price" for such games and/or parts.

Accordingly, said Plaintiff has been engaging in an 34. unfair trade practice in that said Plaintiff has charged to Defendant CIRCLE a price differential which is discriminatory, as compared to the price for which Plaintiff's games and/or parts were sold by Plaintiff to others in the same functional classification as a distributor, as is Defendant CIRCLE.

- 35. Said acts of Plaintiff have been, and are, intentional and for the purpose of injurying and/or destroying Defendant CIRCLE's competitive market-place position.
- That as a direct and proximate result of said acts 36. of Plaintiff, Defendant CIRCLE has been deprived of the patronage of a large number of its actual and potential customers, all to its damage in a sum which Defendant CIRCLE is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, exceeds \$100,000.00. Further, Defendant CIRCLE is entitled to treble its actual damages, plus costs and attorneys' fees, pursuant to the provisions of

そんからんないる

LAW OFFICES
KIRSCH, ARAK AND BULLAASH
280 SOUTH SEVERLY DERY, SUIT 300
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 80218
TRIZHONER (213) 275-0250

いったますけるときいうこと

1

2

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE, Section 17802. When Defendant CIRCLE ascertains the exact amount of its damages, it will seek leave of Court to amend this answer to the complaint, to set forth the same, or according to proof at the time of trial.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

- 37. This answering Defendant repeats and realleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 31 through 36, and by reference thereto incorporates the same herein as though set forth in full.
- 38. That each and every transaction wherein Plaintiff charged Defendant CIRCLE a 150% "premium price" surcharge is an illegal contract within the meaning of CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE, Section 17051, and Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery on each and all of said transactions.

WHEREFORE, Defendant CIRCLE prays Judgment against Plaintiff, as follows:

- That Plaintiff take nothing by virtue of its Complaint on file herein;
- For Judgment on Defendant CIRCLE's Cross-Complaint on file herein;
- 3. That Defendant CIRCLE's actual and statutory troble damages be set off against any amount which the Court may find to be due to Plaintiff:

11111

- 一日本の大ちのとは

- For reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to BUSINESS
 AND PROFESSIONS CODE, Section 17802;
 - Costs of suit incurred herein;
- For such other and further relief as the Court may find just and proper.

DATED this 19 day of September, 1978.

KIRSCH, ARAK AND BULMASH

RICHARD J. GREENE, Attorneys for Defendant CIRCLE INTERNATIONAL CO.